

Appl. No. 09/915,894
Amdt. dated January 19, 2006
Reply to Office action of October 19, 2005

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 9, 12 & 21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Sivan et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,281,874.

Sivan et al teach a method whereby a pair of image files are stored for any particular image. One is a low resolution image, the other is a high resolution image. When an image is desired, the low resolution image is sent to the requesting client and the user is allowed to select a geometric area on that image for viewing at a higher resolution. The selection is transferred to the server, which then serves the high resolution version of the selected area of the image.

Sivan et al may be distinguished from embodiments of the present invention in several ways. Sivan et al require the storage of two independent image files of different resolution for each stored image. This requires additional storage capacity and computational overhead for serving the combination of files. Using the method taught in Sivan et al, two image files must be sent, thereby creating a redundant transmission of data. The low resolution portion of the selected area of the image is actually sent twice. Firstly, in the low resolution file and secondly, in the high-resolution file. Embodiments of the present invention build upon the primary low resolution image by adding higher resolution data to the primary image that has been parsed from a single high-resolution file. This process eliminates redundant transmissions and obviates the need for additional image file storage.

Claims 1 and 21 have been amended to more particularly point out at least one distinction from Sivan et al. These claims, as currently amended, now comprise elements that describe an initial transmission of image data, parsing of the image file to determine what additional data is needed to combine with the initial transmission to render a customized image and sending the

Appl. No. 09/915,894
Amdt. dated January 19, 2006
Reply to Office action of October 19, 2005

additional data to a recipient. These claims also comprise the element of transmitting this additional data to a recipient without retransmitting the initial data.

Sivan et al do not disclose the selection of data to be combined with the initial or representative data to form a customized image or the efficient transmission of this data to a recipient without retransmitting the initial data.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 21 now comprise patentable elements not found in the prior art and are in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 3, 7, 8, 9 and 12 are dependent on claim 1 and comprise all the elements thereof. These claims are therefore patentable for the reasons stated above in relation to claim 1.

Claims 2, 3, 7-9 and 12 are dependent on claim 1 and comprise all the elements thereof. Accordingly, they are now patentable for the reasons put forth in relation to claim 1 above.

The examiner has rejected claims 4 & 6 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivan et al in view of Li, J. et al (ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG1 N1473). This rejection relies on the prior §102 rejection of claim 1 while citing Li et al as teaching selection of resolution and ROI data as well as streaming. As claim 1 has been amended to overcome the 102 rejection and Li et al do not teach any further parsing of the image file to determine what parts are needed, in combination with the initial parts, to form a customized image, these claims are now allowable for the reasons stated in relation to claim 1 above.

The examiner has rejected claims 5, 13, 15, 16 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivan et al in view of Duhault et al (US Pat. No. 5,900,868).

Appl. No. 09/915,894
Amdt. dated January 19, 2006
Reply to Office action of October 19, 2005

This rejection relies on the prior §102 rejection of claims 1 and 13 while citing Duhault et al as teaching interaction with a thumbnail image. As claims 1 and 13 have been amended to overcome the §102 rejection and Duhault et al do not teach any further parsing of the image file to determine additional parts, which in combination with said initial or representative part, may form a customized image, these claims are now allowable for the reasons stated in relation to claims 1 and 13 above.

The examiner has rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivan et al in view of Li, C et al (US Pat. No. 6,345,279).

This rejection relies on the prior §102 rejection of claim 1 while citing Li et al as teaching a content adaptation process based on network bandwidth. As claim 1 has been amended to overcome the §102 rejection and Li, C et al do not teach any further parsing of the image file to determine additional parts, which in combination with said initial or representative part, may form a customized image, these claims are now allowable for the reasons stated in relation to claim 1 above.

The examiner has rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sivan et al in view of Duhault et al (US Pat. No. 5,900,868) and further in view of Li, J. et al (ISO/IEC JTC1/SC29/WG1 N1473).


This rejection relies on the prior §102 rejection of claim 13 while citing Li, J et al as teaching region-of-interest selection and streaming a JPEG2000 file over a network. As claim 1 has been amended to overcome the §102 rejection and Li, J et al and Duhault et al do not teach any further parsing of the image file to determine additional parts, which in combination with

Appl. No. 09/915,894
Amdt. dated January 19, 2006
Reply to Office action of October 19, 2005

said initial or representative part, may form a customized image, these claims are now allowable for the reasons stated in relation to claim 13 above.

In light of the arguments above, all claims are considered to be novel, non-obvious and patentable in view of the cited art. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner promptly allow these claims and proceed with issuance of this application. The Examiner is invited to contact applicant's attorney directly for any reason.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott C. Krieger
Reg. No. 42,768
Tel. No.: (360) 828-0589